arXiv:0803.2058v1 [math.CV] 13 Mar 2008

SCHWARZ LEMMA FOR THE TETRABLOCK

ARMEN EDIGARIAN AND WŁODZIMIERZ ZWONEK

Abstract. We describe all complex geodesics in the tetrablock passing through the origin thus obtaining the form of all extremals in the Schwarz Lemma for the tetrablock. Some other extremals for the Lempert function and geodesics are also given. The paper may be seen as a continuation of the results from [2]. The proofs rely on a necessary form of complex geodesics in general domains which is also proven in the paper.

1. Introduction and main results

Let us recall two holomorphically invariant families of functions. For a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, $w, z \in D$ define the *Lempert function* $\tilde{k}_D$ as follows

$$\tilde{k}_D(w,z) := \inf\{p(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) : \text{ there is } f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D},D) \text{ such that } f(\lambda_1)=w,\ f(\lambda_2)=z\}$$

and the *Carathéodory pseudodistance* c_D

$$c_D(w,z) := \sup\{p(F(w),F(z)) : F \in \mathcal{O}(D,\mathbb{D})\},$$

where $\mathcal{O}(\Omega_1,\Omega_2)$ denotes the set of all holomorphic mappings $\Omega_1 \to \Omega_2$ and p denotes the Poincaré distance on the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$. Basic properties and results on both functions as well as definitions of taut and hyperconvex domains that we use in our paper one may find in [12].

It is well-known that $c_D \le \tilde{k}_D$ on any domain D.

In 1981 L. Lempert proved the following important result (see [13], [12], [8]).

Theorem 1. *Let D be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $\{D_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of domains exhausting D, i.e., $D_1 \subset D_2 \subset \cdots \subset D$ and $\cup_{j=1}^{\infty} D_j = D$. Assume that any D_j is biholomorphic to a convex domain. Then $c_D = \tilde{k}_D$.*

For more then twenty years in was an open question whether any bounded pseudoconvex domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $c_D = \tilde{k}_D$ can be exhausted by domains biholomorphically equivalent to a convex domain.

In 2001 J. Agler and N.J. Young introduced the symmetrized bidisc $\mathbb{G}_2$ (see [3]), a domain which turns up in control engineering and produces problems of a function-theoretic character. In particular, the equality $c_{\mathbb{G}_2}(0,\cdot) = \tilde{k}_{\mathbb{G}_2}(0,\cdot)$ on $\mathbb{G}_2$ has been shown in [3]. This

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32F45.

Key words and phrases. tetrablock, Lempert Theorem, complex geodesic, Lempert function, Carathéodory distance.

The paper was partially supported by the Research Grant of the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education No. 1 PO3A 005 28.

result was extended later to the identity $c_{\mathbb{G}_2} \equiv \tilde{k}_{\mathbb{G}_2}$ (see [7], [4]). The symmetrized bidisc and its higher dimensional analogue, the symmetrized polydisc $\mathbb{G}_n$, has been recently extensively studied (see e.g. [3], [4], [7], [16], [11], [5] and others). It was shown that $\mathbb{G}_2$ cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex ones (see [7], [10]). So symmetrized bidisc delivers a counterexample to the above problem.

In two papers [2] and [18] and in the PhD Thesis [1] the Authors initiated the study of another domain which also naturally appears in control engineering and produces problems of a function-theoretic character. The *tetrablock* is a domain in $\mathbb{C}^3$, denoted by $\mathbb{E}$, which is the image of the Cartan domain $R_I(2,2)$ upon the mapping $\pi(A) := (a_{11}, a_{22}, \det A)$, $A = (a_{jk})_{j,k=1,2} \in \mathbb{C}^{2\times 2}$. In the paper [2] several equivalent definitions of the domain $\mathbb{E}$ are given. Recall one of them

$$\mathbb{E} = \{(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : |z_1 - \bar{z}_2 z_3| + |z_2 - \bar{z}_1 z_3| + |z_3|^2 < 1\}. \tag{1}$$

It is proven in [2] that the equality between the Carathéodory distance and the Lempert function of $\mathbb{E}$ with fixed at the origin one of the arguments,

$$c_{\mathbb{E}}(0,\cdot) = \tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}(0,\cdot)$$

holds on $\mathbb{E}$, which suggests that the equality between both functions could hold on $\mathbb{E} \times \mathbb{E}$. In our paper we deal with this domain. We find all the solutions of the extremal problem in the Schwarz Lemma for the tetrablock (in other words all functions $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$ such that $f(0) = 0$ and $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}(f(0), f(\lambda)) = p(0,\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$). Moreover, we find some other $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$-extremals and complex geodesics and we make several observations which may lead to the solution of the problem whether the Lempert Theorem is valid on $\mathbb{E}$.

The equality of the Lempert function and the Caratheodory pseudodistance on a given domain is closely related to the notion of a complex geodesic. A holomorphic mapping $f : \mathbb{D} \to D$ is called a *(complex) geodesic* if there exists a mapping $F : D \to \mathbb{D}$ such that $F \circ f$ is an automorphism of $\mathbb{D}$ (without loss of generality, one can assume that $F \circ f = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{D}}$). Note that if $f : \mathbb{D} \to D$ is a complex geodesic then $c_D = \tilde{k}_D$ on $f(\mathbb{D}) \times f(\mathbb{D})$.

It is proven in [2] that on the tetrablock complex geodesics passing through the origin and another, arbitrary, point of $\mathbb{E}$ exist. Moreover, for any $z \in \mathbb{E}$ a geodesic passing through 0 and z is given. In our paper we give a description of all such geodesics. This result may be seen as a Schwarz-type Lemma for the tetrablock.

Theorem 2. *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \to \bar{\mathbb{D}}$ be a holomorphic mapping such that $\varphi(0) = -C$, where $C \in [0,1]$. Then for any $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ the mapping*

$$f(\lambda) = \Big(\omega_1 \frac{\varphi(\lambda) + C}{1 + C}, \omega_2 \lambda \frac{1 + C\varphi(\lambda)}{1 + C}, \omega_1\omega_2\lambda\varphi(\lambda)\Big) \tag{2}$$

is a complex geodesic in $\mathbb{E}$. Moreover, any complex geodesic $f : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{E}$ such that $f(0) = 0$ is (up to a permutation of two first variables) of type (2).

Since the set $S := \{z \in \mathbb{E} : z_1 z_2 = z_3\}$ is the orbit of 0 of the group $\operatorname{Aut}\mathbb{E}$ (see [2] and [18]), the above theorem gives the full description of complex geodesics intersecting S.

In the proof of Theorem 2 the main role is played by a result giving a necessary condition on complex geodesics in domains with a lot of automorphisms. Similar characterizations one can find e.g. in [17], [9], see also [12].

Theorem 3. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a domain and let $f : \mathbb{D} \to D$, $F : D \to \mathbb{D}$ be holomorphic mappings such that $F \circ f = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{D}}$. Suppose that $\Phi : (-\tau, \tau) \times D \to D$, $\tau > 0$, is a C^2 mapping with*

(1) $\Phi_0 = \mathrm{id}$, *where* $\Phi_t = \Phi(t, \cdot)$*;*
(2) $\Phi_t : D \to D$ *is a holomorphic mapping.*

Then there exists a $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\psi(\lambda) = -\bar{\psi}(0)\lambda^2 + iC\lambda + \psi(0) \quad \textit{for any } \lambda \in \mathbb{D},$$

where

$$\psi(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial F}{\partial z_j}(f(\lambda))\gamma_j(f(\lambda))$$

and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n) : D \to \mathbb{C}^n$ is a vector field on D generated by a family $\{\Phi_t\}_{|t|<\tau}$, i.e., $\gamma(z) = \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\Phi_t(z) - z}{t}$.

In the paper we also deliver some other $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$-extremals (which, assuming the equality $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}} = c_{\mathbb{E}}$ would be complex geodesics) which are essentially different from the ones given in Theorem 2 (see Corollary 10); we make also some observations which may lead to the better understanding of the geometry of $\mathbb{E}$.

2. Circular domains and complex geodesics

We start this section with the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof. Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$. Consider functions $a(t) = F(\Phi_t(f(\lambda)))$ and $b(t) = F(\Phi_t(f(0)))$. Note that $a(0) = \lambda$, $a'(0) = \psi(\lambda)$, $b(0) = 0$ and $b'(0) = \psi(0)$.

¿From the Schwarz-Pick lemma (see e.g. [12]) for any $t \in (-\tau, \tau)$ we have

$$\Big|\frac{a(t) - b(t)}{1 - \bar{b}(t)a(t)}\Big| \leq |\lambda| = \Big|\frac{a(0) - b(0)}{1 - \bar{b}(0)a(0)}\Big|.$$

Therefore, the function $\rho(t) := \Big|\frac{a(t)-b(t)}{1-\bar{b}(t)a(t)}\Big|^2$ attains its maximum at $t = 0$ and, therefore, $\rho'(0) = 0$. We have

$$\rho'(0) = 2\,\mathrm{Re}\left(a'(0)\overline{a}(0) - \overline{a}(0)b'(0)(1 - |a(0)|)^2\right).$$

From this we get $\mathrm{Re}\left(\frac{\psi(\lambda)-\psi(0)}{\lambda} + \lambda\overline{\psi}(0)\right) = 0$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$. Since ψ is a holomorphic function on $\mathbb{D}$ there exists a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\frac{\psi(\lambda)-\psi(0)}{\lambda} + \lambda\overline{\psi}(0) = iC$. □

Before we apply Theorem 3 in the proof of Theorem 2 we make some remarks how this theorem may be applied in the study of complex geodesics in domains with many symmetries.

The families $\{\Phi_t\}$ we are going to consider are one-parameter groups of transformations on circular type domains. Recall that $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$-*circular* if $(e^{i\alpha_1 t} z_1, \dots, e^{i\alpha_n t} z_n) \in D$ for any $(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in D$ and any $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Here $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$. For any such a domain we consider a mapping $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \times D \to D$ defined as $\Phi(t, z) = (e^{it\alpha_1} z_1, \dots, e^{it\alpha_n} z_n)$. Note that in this case $\gamma(z) = i(\alpha_1 z_1, \dots, \alpha_n z_n)$. So, from Theorem 3 we get

Corollary 4. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be an $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$-circular domain and let $f : \mathbb{D} \to D$, $F : D \to \mathbb{D}$ be holomorphic mappings such that $F \circ f = \mathrm{id}$. Then there exist constants $C \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \in \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j \frac{\partial F}{\partial z_j}(f(\lambda)) f_j(\lambda) = \overline{a}\lambda^2 + C\lambda + a \qquad \text{for any } \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Now we are giving some examples of applications of our result. Let us start with Reinhardt domains, which are seemingly well understood (see [19]). Even in this case we get new results.

2.1. **Reinhardt domains.**

Recal that a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is called *Reinhardt* if it is $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$-circular for any $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$.

Corollary 5. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a Reinhardt domain and let $f : \mathbb{D} \to D$, $F : D \to \mathbb{D}$ be holomorphic mappings such that $F \circ f = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{D}}$. Then for any $j = 1, \dots, n$ there exist constants $a_j \in \mathbb{C}$ and $C_j \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_j}(f(\lambda)) f_j(\lambda) = \overline{a}_j \lambda^2 + C_j \lambda + a_j \qquad \text{for any } \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

In particular, for any complex geodesic $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n) : \mathbb{D} \to D$ and for any $j = 1, \dots, n$ the following situation holds: f_j has at most one zero in $\mathbb{D}$, $f_j \equiv 0$ or $\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_j}(f(\cdot)) \equiv 0$.

Note that the example of the bidisc and geodesics of the form $f : \mathbb{D} \ni \lambda \to (\lambda, b(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{D}^2$ with $b \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$, $b(0) = 0$ shows that there are geodesics such that f_j has (even infinitely) many zeros but $f_j \not\equiv 0$.

2.2. **The symmetrized bidisc.**

We call a domain

$$\mathbb{G}_2 = \{(\lambda + \mu, \lambda\mu) : \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{D}\}$$

the *symmetrized bidisc* (see [3]). Note that the symmetrized bidisc is $(1, 2)$-circular. The uniqueness result on geodesics and their complete description in $\mathbb{G}_2$ are given in [16] and [5]. Here, we show how one can use our results to give a simpler proof of the description of all geodesics in $\mathbb{G}_2$ passing through the origin.

Assume that $f = (f_1, f_2) : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{G}_2$ is a complex geodesic such that $f(0) = 0$. It is shown in [3] that there exists an $\omega \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ such that $F \circ f = \mathrm{id}_{\mathbb{D}}$, where $F(z_1, z_2) = \frac{2\omega z_2 - z_1}{2 - \omega z_1}$.

Note that

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_1}(f)f_1 = \frac{-2+2\omega^2 f_2}{(2-\omega f_1)^2}f_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial z_2}(f)f_2 = \frac{2\omega}{2-\omega f_1}f_2.$$

and, therefore,

$$\frac{-2+2\omega^2 f_2(\lambda)}{(2-\omega f_1(\lambda))^2}f_1 + 2\frac{2\omega}{2-\omega f_1(\lambda)}f_2(\lambda) = C\lambda$$

for some $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\frac{2\omega f_2 - f_1}{2-\omega f_1}$ is the identity, we get the equality $2\omega f_2 = f_1 + \lambda(2-\omega f_1)$ on $\mathbb{D}$, so the following equality has to be satisfied on $\mathbb{D}$

$$f_1^2(\lambda\omega^2 - \omega - C\lambda\omega^2) + f_1(2 - 6\lambda\omega + 4C\lambda\omega) + 4\lambda(2-C) = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$f_1(\lambda) = \frac{-(2-6\lambda\omega+4C\lambda\omega) \pm 2(\lambda\omega+1)}{2\omega(\lambda\omega - 1 - C\lambda\omega)}, \ \lambda \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Since $f_1(0) = 0$ we get that $f_1(\lambda) = \frac{2(2-C)\lambda}{\omega\lambda(1-C)-1}$, and then $f_2(\lambda) = \lambda\frac{\lambda - \bar{\omega}(1-C)}{1-\lambda\omega(1-C)}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. Since $f_1(\mathbb{D}) \subset 2\mathbb{D}$ and $f_2(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathbb{D}$ applying the Schwarz Lemma we get that $|2-C| \leq 1$ and $|1-C| \leq 1$; which gives the condition $C \in [1,2]$. It is simple to see that this condition is not only necessary but also sufficient (see e. g. [16] and [5]).

3. Description of complex geodesics of the tetrablock passing through the origin

Before we present the proof of Theorem 2 let us present some basic properties of the tetrablock. The properties that we present below are either obvious or come from [2], [1] or [18].

It is obvious that the permutation of two first variables, i.e. the mapping σ given by the formula $\sigma(z_1, z_2, z_3) = (z_2, z_1, z_3)$, is an automorphism of $\mathbb{E}$.

For any $\omega \in \partial\mathbb{E}$ the mapping F_ω given by the formula $F_\omega(z) = (\omega z_1, z_2, \omega z_3)$, is also an automorphism of $\mathbb{E}$. Hence, the tetrablock is $(1,0,1)$ and $(0,1,1)$-circular.

Recall that $z \in \mathbb{E}$ iff $|\Psi_\eta(x)| < 1$ for any $\eta \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$, where

$$\Psi_\eta(z_1, z_2, z_3) = \frac{\eta z_3 - z_2}{\eta z_1 - 1}.$$

It is quite simple to see that there is a continuous function $\rho : \mathbb{E} \mapsto [0,\infty)$ such that $\log\rho$ is plurisubharmonic and $\rho(\lambda z_1, \lambda z_2, \lambda^2 z_3) = |\lambda|\rho(z)$ for any $z = (z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{E}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. This shows that $\mathbb{E}$ is a hyperconvex domain; in particular, $\mathbb{E}$ is a taut domain, too.

Note also that for any $z \in \mathbb{E}$ the inequalities $|z_j| < 1$, $j = 1,2,3$, hold.

Proof of Theorem 2. Assume that $\varphi, \psi : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{D}$ are holomorphic mappings and that $C \in [0,1)$. Then for any $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ the mapping

$$f(\lambda) = \Big(\omega_1\frac{\varphi(\lambda)+C}{1+C}, \omega_2\psi(\lambda)\frac{1+C\varphi(\lambda)}{1+C}, \omega_1\omega_2\varphi(\lambda)\psi(\lambda)\Big) \tag{3}$$

satisfies the inclusion $f(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathbb{E}$.

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_1 - \overline{f}_2 f_3| &= \Big|\frac{\varphi + C}{1+C} - \overline{\psi}\frac{1+C\overline{\varphi}}{1+C}\varphi\psi\Big| = \frac{|\varphi(1-|\psi|^2) + C(1-|\varphi|^2|\psi|^2)|}{1+C}, \\ |f_2 - \overline{f}_1 f_3| &= \Big|\psi\frac{1+\varphi C}{1+C} - \frac{\overline{\varphi}+C}{1+C}\varphi\psi\Big| = \frac{|\psi|(1-|\varphi|^2)}{1+C} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |f_1 - \overline{f}_2 f_3| + |f_2 - \overline{f}_1 f_3| + |f_3|^2 \leq \frac{|\varphi|(1-|\psi|^2) + C(1-|\varphi|^2|\psi|^2)}{1+C} + \frac{|\psi|(1-|\varphi|^2)}{1+C} \\ + |\varphi|^2|\psi|^2 < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Psi_{\overline{\omega}_1} \circ f(\lambda) = \omega_2\psi(\lambda)$. Hence, if ψ is an automorphism then f is a complex geodesic. In particular, the sufficient part of Theorem 2 is proven (the case $C = 1$ and $\varphi \equiv -1$, which formally is not covered by the above reasoning, is simple).

Take now any geodesic $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$ such that $f(0) = 0$. It follows from [2] there is an $\omega \in \partial\mathbb{D}$ such that $\Phi \circ \varphi$ is a rotation, where $\Phi = \Psi_\omega$ or $\Phi = \Psi_\omega \circ \sigma$. Since σ and F_ω are automorphisms of $\mathbb{E}$ we easily arrive at the following statement. In order to show that all geodesics of $\mathbb{E}$ with $f(0) = 0$ are of the form given in the theorem it is sufficient to show that all geodesics $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$ with $f(0) = 0$ such that $\Psi_1 \circ f$ are as in the theorem.

So, take $F = \Psi_1$. We are going to find necessary form of all right inverses $f : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{E}$ of F (for a while we assume that $f(0)$ may take any value in $\mathbb{E}$). Note that $\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_1} = \frac{z_2 - z_3}{(z_1-1)^2}$ and $\frac{\partial F}{\partial z_3} = \frac{1}{z_1 - 1}$. Hence, in view of Corollary 4 there exist constants $a \in \mathbb{C}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\frac{f_1(\lambda)f_2(\lambda) - f_3(\lambda)}{(f_1(\lambda)-1)^2} = \overline{a}\lambda^2 + C\lambda + a. \tag{4}$$

Since f is the right inverse of F, we have $f_3(\lambda) - f_2(\lambda) = \lambda(f_1(\lambda) - 1)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$. From this and (4) we get

$$\begin{cases} f_1(\lambda) = & (f_3(\lambda) + \overline{a}\lambda^2 + C\lambda + a)/(\overline{a}\lambda^2 + (C+1)\lambda + a) \\ f_2(\lambda) = & (f_3(\lambda)(\overline{a}\lambda^2 + C\lambda + a) + \lambda^2)/(\overline{a}\lambda^2 + (C+1)\lambda + a). \end{cases}$$

But $f_1(0) = f_3(0) = 0$ so $a = 0$ and, therefore,

$$\begin{cases} f_1(\lambda) = & (\varphi(\lambda) + C)/(C+1) \\ f_2(\lambda) = & \lambda(\varphi(\lambda)C + 1)/(C+1) \\ f_3(\lambda) = & \lambda\varphi(\lambda), \end{cases}$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a holomorphic mapping. Since $f_1, f_2, f_3 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$ and $f(0) = 0$, we get that $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \bar{\mathbb{D}})$, $\varphi(0) = -C$. The Schwarz Lemma applied to f_2 and f_3 gives the inequalities $|C| \leq 1$ and $|1 - C| \leq 1$, so $C \in [0, 1]$. Hence, we have finished the proof. ☐

Remark 6. It was shown in [2] that no uniqueness of geodesics (even passing through 0) is possible in the case of $\mathbb{E}$. This can also be easily seen from Theorem 2. But we may show also in a different (simple) way. Namely, consider the following embedding

$$\Phi : \mathbb{D}^2 \ni (\lambda, \mu) \mapsto (\lambda, \mu, \lambda\mu) \in \mathbb{E}.$$

Now the inequalities

$$d_{\mathbb{D}^2}((\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2)) \geq d_{\mathbb{E}}((\lambda_1, \mu_1, \lambda_1\mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2, \lambda_2\mu_2)) \geq d_{\mathbb{D}^2}((\lambda_1, \mu_1), \lambda_2, \mu_2)),$$

where $d = \tilde{k}$ or c, together with the equality $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{D}^2} = c_{\mathbb{D}^2}$ show that

$$\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}((\lambda_1, \mu_1, \lambda_1\mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2, \lambda_2\mu_2)) = c_{\mathbb{E}}((\lambda_1, \mu_1, \lambda_1\mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2, \lambda_2\mu_2))$$

for any $(\lambda_1, \mu_1), (\lambda_2, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$. Moreover, any mapping of the form

$$\mathbb{D} \ni \lambda \mapsto (a(\lambda), b(\lambda), a(\lambda)b(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{E},$$

where $a, b \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$ and at least one of the functions a, b is an automorphism of $\mathbb{D}$, is a complex geodesic, which easily delivers non-uniqueness result for geodesics (passing through 0) - to make it visible consider the functions $\mathbb{D} \ni \lambda \mapsto (\lambda, b(\lambda), \lambda b(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{E}$, where b is an arbitrary function (out of many) from $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$ such that $b(0) = 0$ and $b(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{4}$. In fact, it is easy to see that all the geodesics passing through two points from the set $S = \{z \in \mathbb{E} : z_1z_2 = z_3\} = \Phi(\mathbb{D}^2)$ are of the above form. To see this take two different points of the form $\Phi(\lambda_1, \mu_1), \Phi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$ from $\mathbb{E}$. Without loss of generality assume that $p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \geq p(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and the geodesic f is such that $f(\lambda_1) = \Phi(\lambda_1, \mu_1)$, $f(\lambda_2) = \Phi(\lambda_2, \mu_2)$. Then $\Psi_\omega \circ \sigma \circ f, f_1 \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$ and both functions map λ_j into λ_j, $j = 1, 2$, which in view of the Schwarz-Pick Lemma gives that they are both identities, which easily shows the desired form of f.

Remark 7. Note that the boundary of $\mathbb{E}$ contains many non-constant holomorphic discs. Fix a constant $C \in [0, 1]$ and a holomorphic function $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$. Then it follows from calculations made in the proof of Theorem 2 that $f : \mathbb{D} \to \partial\mathbb{E}$, where

$$f(\lambda) = \Big(\omega_1 \frac{\varphi(\lambda) + C}{1 + C}, \omega_2 \frac{1 + C\varphi(\lambda)}{1 + C}, \omega_1\omega_2\varphi(\lambda)\Big).$$

4. The Lempert function of the tetrablock

Note that $\mathbb{E} \cap (\{0\} \times \mathbb{C}^2) = \{(0, z, w) : |z| + |w| < 1\}$. We may calculate the Lempert function for some special points – note that in the proof of the result below we make use of $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$-extremals omitting the special set S.

Proposition 8. *For any $z, w \in \mathbb{D}$, such that $|z| + |w| < 1$ we have*

$$\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}\big((0, 0, w), (0, z, w)\big) = \frac{|z|}{1 - |w|}. \tag{5}$$

Recall that a mapping $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, D)$ such that $\tilde{k}_D(f(\lambda_1), f(\lambda_2)) = p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ for some $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$ is called a *$\tilde{k}_D$-extremal* for $(f(\lambda_1), f(\lambda_2))$. Recall that if D is taut then for any $w, z \in D$ there is a $\tilde{k}_D$-extremal for (w, z). It is easy to see that if $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, D)$ is such that $f(\mathbb{D}) \subset\subset D$ then f is not a $\tilde{k}_D$-extremal for any $(w, z) \in D \times D$ with $w \neq z$.

To prove Proposition 8 we follow the ideas on transportation of $\tilde{k}$-extremals (and complex geodesics) that may be found in [15], [19] (and references there).

First note that for any $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$ with the equality $f_1(0) = f_3(0) = 0$ the function $\tilde{f}$ given by the formula $\tilde{f}(\lambda) := (\frac{f_1(\lambda)}{\lambda}, f_2(\lambda), \frac{f_3(\lambda)}{\lambda})$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ (certainly here and later we mean $\tilde{f}_j(0) = f_j'(0)$, $j = 1, 3$), is either from $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \partial\mathbb{E})$ or from $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$. Indeed, to see this apply the maximum principle for subharmonic functions and the plurisubharmonicity of $\log \rho$.

Lemma 9. *Let* $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$ *be a* $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$*-extremal for* $(f(0), f(\sigma))$*, where* $\sigma \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$ *and* $f(0) = (0, x_2, 0)$*. Then either* $\tilde{f}(\mathbb{D}) \subset \partial\mathbb{E}$ *or* $\tilde{f}$ *is a* $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$*-extremal for* $(\tilde{f}(0), \tilde{f}(\sigma))$*.*

Proof. We already know that $\tilde{f}(\mathbb{D}) \subset \partial\mathbb{E}$ or $\tilde{f}(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathbb{E}$. Assume that the second property holds. Suppose that $\tilde{f}$ is not a $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$-extremal for $(\tilde{f}(0), \tilde{f}(\sigma))$. Then there would exist a $g \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$ such that $g(\mathbb{D}) \subset\subset \mathbb{E}$, $g(0) = \tilde{f}(0)$ and $g(\sigma) = \tilde{f}(\sigma)$. But then $\tilde{g}(0) = f(0)$, $\tilde{g}(\sigma) = f(\sigma)$, where $\tilde{g}(\lambda) = (\lambda g_1(\lambda), g_2(\lambda), \lambda g_3(\lambda))$. But $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{E})$ and $\tilde{g}(\mathbb{D}) \subset\subset \mathbb{E}$ - a contradiction with the $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$-extremality of f. □

Corollary 10. *Assume that* $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{D})$ *is not an automorphism and let* $\varphi(0) = -C$*, where* $C \in (0, 1)$*. Let* $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \partial\mathbb{D}$*. Put* $f(\lambda) := (\frac{\omega_1(\varphi(\lambda)+C)}{\lambda(1+C)}, \omega_2\lambda\frac{1+C\varphi(\lambda)}{1+C}, \omega_1\omega_2\varphi(\lambda))$*. Then* f *is a* $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$*-extremal for* $(f(0), f(\sigma))$*,* $\sigma \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$*.*

Proof. In view of Lemma 9 it is sufficient to see that $f(0) = \left(\omega_1\frac{\varphi'(0)}{1+C}, 0, -\omega_1\omega_2 C\right) \in \mathbb{E}$. But in view of the Schwarz-Pick Lemma (it is important here that φ is not an automorphism) $|\varphi'(0)| < 1 - C^2$.

□

Remark 11. Note that the $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$-extremals from Corollary 10 omit the set S.

Moreover, substituting $\varphi \equiv -C$, $C \in [0, 1)$ we get $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$-extremals of the form

$$f(\lambda) = (0, \lambda(1 - C), -C), \ \lambda \in \mathbb{D} \tag{6}$$

Proof of Proposition 8. The proof follows directly from the fact that $f(\lambda) = (0, \lambda(1 - C), -C)$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{D}$ is a $\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{E}}$-extremal for $(f(0), f(\lambda))$. □

5. A REMARK ON CARATHÉODORY DISTANCE OF THE TETRABLOCK

Define

$$p_{\mathbb{E}}(w, z) := \sup\{p(\Psi_\omega(w), \Psi_\omega(w)), p(\Psi_\omega(\sigma(w)), \Psi_\omega(\sigma(z))) : \omega \in \partial\mathbb{D}\}, \ w, z \in \mathbb{E}. \tag{7}$$

It is evident that $p_{\mathbb{E}} \leq c_{\mathbb{E}}$. We prove the following

Proposition 12. $p_{\mathbb{E}} \not\equiv c_{\mathbb{E}}$.

Proof. Note that for $\lambda\in\mathbb{D}\setminus\{0\}$, $C\in(0,1)$ we get

$$(8)\quad p_{\mathbb{E}}((0,0,-C),(0,\lambda(1-C),-C))=$$
$$\sup\{p(\omega C,\omega C+\lambda(1-C)),p(\omega C,\frac{\omega C}{1-\omega\lambda(1-C)}):\omega\in\partial\mathbb{D}\}=$$
$$\max\{p(0,\frac{|\lambda|}{1+C-C|\lambda|}),p(0,\frac{C|\lambda|}{1+C-|\lambda|})\}=p(0,\frac{|\lambda|}{1+C-C|\lambda|}).$$

Consider now the function $F(z):=\frac{z_2}{\sqrt{1+z_3-z_1z_2}}$, $z\in\mathbb{E}$. Note that $F\in\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D},\mathbb{E})$ – to see this write $z=\pi(A)$, where A is a symmetric 2×2 matrix of the norm smaller than 1. Then $F(z)=a_{22}/\sqrt{1-a_{12}^2}$, and now it is sufficient to recall that $|a_{22}|^2+|a_{12}|^2<1$.

Consequently, $c_{\mathbb{E}}((0,0,-C),(0,\lambda(1-C),-C))\geq p(0,|\lambda|\sqrt{1-C})$ but the last number is for sufficiently small $C\in(0,1)$ larger than $p(0,\frac{|\lambda|}{1+C-C|\lambda|})$ for small λ. □

Recall that the function $p_{\mathbb{G}_n}$ – similar in the construction to $p_{\mathbb{E}}$ was used while studying the problem of the Lempert theorem for $\mathbb{G}_n$. Recall that the following (in)equalities hold: $p_{\mathbb{G}_2}=c_{\mathbb{G}_2}=\tilde{k}_{\mathbb{G}_2}$ (see [7], [4]) and $p_{\mathbb{G}_n}\leq c_{\mathbb{G}_n}$ and $p_{\mathbb{G}_n}\not\equiv c_{\mathbb{G}_n}$, $n\geq 3$ (see [14]). The function p_D ($D=\mathbb{E}$ or $\mathbb{G}_n$) or its some generalization to more general domains may have some connection with the class of magic functions as defined and considered in [6].

References

1. A. A. Abouhajar, *Function theory related to H^∞ control*, Ph.D. thesis, Newcastle University, 2007.
2. A. A. Abouhajar, M. C. White & N. J. Young, *A Schwarz lemma for a domain related to mu-synthesis*, J. Geom. Anal. 17 (2007), 717-750.
3. J. Agler & N. J. Young, *A Schwarz lemma for the symmetrized bidisc*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 33 (2001), 175–186.
4. J. Agler & N. J. Young, *The hyperbolic geometry of the symmetrized bidisc*, J. Geom. Anal. 14 (2004), no. 3, 375–403.
5. J. Agler & N. J. Young, *The complex geodesics of the symmetrized bidisc* Internat. J. Math. 17 (2006), 375–391.
6. J. Agler, N. J. Young, *The magic functions and automorphisms of a domain*, preprint.
7. C. Costara, *Le probleḿe de Nevanlinna-Pick spectral*, Ph.D. thesis, Université Laval, 2004.
8. A. Edigarian, *A remark on the Lempert theorem*, Univ. Iagel. Acta Math. 32 (1995), 83–88.
9. A. Edigarian, *On extremal mappings in complex ellipsoids*, Ann. Polon. Math. 62 (1995), 83–96.
10. A. Edigarian, *A note on Costara's paper*, Ann. Polon. Math. 83 (2004), 189-191.
11. A. Edigarian, W. Zwonek, *Geometry of the symmetrized polydisc* Arch. Math. (Basel) 84 (2005), no. 4, 364–374.
12. M. Jarnicki & P. Pflug, *Invariant Distances and Metrics in Complex Analysis*, De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics 9, 1993.
13. L. Lempert, *La métrique de Kobayashi et la représentation des domaines sur la boule*, Bull. Soc. Math. France 109 (1981), no. 4, 427–474.
14. N. Nikolov, P. Pflug, P. J. Thomas, W. Zwonek, *Estimates of the Carathéodory metric of the symmetrized polydisc*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 341 (2008), 140–148.
15. P. Pflug, W. Zwonek, *Effective formulas for invariant functions—case of elementary Reinhardt domains* Ann. Polon. Math. 69 (1998), no. 2, 175–196.

16. P. Pflug & W. Zwonek, *Description of all complex geodesics in the symmetrized bidisc.*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 37 (2005), 575–584.
17. E. Poletsky, *The Euler-Lagrange equations for extremal holomorphic mappings of the unit disk*, Michigan Math. J. 30 (1983), 317–333.
18. N. J. Young, *The automorphism group of the tetrablock*, preprint.
19. W. Zwonek, *Completeness, Reinhardt domains and the method of complex geodesics in the theory of invariant functions*, Dissertationes Math. 388 (2000), 103 pp.

Institute of Mathematics, Jagiellonian University, Reymonta 4, 30-059 Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: `Armen.Edigarian@im.uj.edu.pl`

Institute of Mathematics, Jagiellonian University, Reymonta 4, 30-059 Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: `Wlodzimierz.Zwonek@im.uj.edu.pl`